



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,292	12/28/2001	Jae Seong Rhee	217831US2	3118

22850 7590 08/24/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

LIM, KRISNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,292

Applicant(s)

RHEE ET AL.

Examiner

Krisna Lim

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.
2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what the applicant really means by "a presentation paper" and "a presentation paper making-up utility".

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsui et al. [6,742,116]. This reference has been used in the previous action.

5. Matsui et al. disclosed (e.g., see Figs. 1-15) the invention substantially as claimed. Taking claim 1 as an exemplary claim, the reference discloses a method for constructing and operating a cyber-conference (an electronic conference room, chat rooms, col. 7, lines 19-54) in a system which interconnects a user client (user's terminals A, B, C of Fig. 1, a conference client (chat client 12 of Fig. 1, a cyber-conference operating server (chat server 100 of Fig. 1, col. 7, line 29), a program storage unit and a database through a communication network (Fig. 1), comprising the steps of:

a) accessing a cyber-conference operating website (chat room) provided by the cyber conference operation server (chat server 100 of Fig. 1, col. 7, line 29) (e.g., see col. 1 (line 65) to col. 2 (line 6), col. 7 (lines 19-54);

b) applying for registration to the cyber-conference operation server (e.g., see col. 2, lines 1-4);

c) approving the registration based on data stored on the database (e.g., see col. 3, lines 19-31) in response to the application for registration from the conference client;

d) creating a cyber conference through the communication network by using a cyber-conference creation program stored on the program storage unit (e.g., see col. 3, lines 47-52).

e) providing, at the cyber-conference operation server, the user client with a presentation paper making-up utility (security program ... that can display a command button on the screen, the electronic conference room, an icon, see Fig. 2 and col. 5);

f) receiving, at the conference client, a presentation paper from the user client, wherein said presentation paper has been written using the presentation paper making-up utility of step (e) (e.g., see col. 5); and

f) publishing (displaying), at the conference client, a journal of papers presented during the cyber-conference (display a sign such as an icon ... to identifying the electronic room ..., col. 5) including the presentation paper of step (f).

Matsui et al. did not explicitly mention the term "a presentation page making-up utility" and "publishing a journal of papers presented during the cyber-conference". To the extent of the claimed language interpretation and since the claims are given the

broadest interpretation, examiner interprets that “a presentation page making-up utility” would have been obviously “a security program ... that can display a command button on the screen, the electronic conference room, an icon ..” and “publishing a journal of papers presented during the cyber-conference” would have been obviously “display a sign such as an icon ... to identifying the electronic room ...”

6. As to claim 2, Matsui et al. further anticipates the steps of: e) holding a meeting of the created cyber-conference (chat, col. 7, lines 19-54); and f) processing data related to the meeting (e.g., see col. 7, lines 19-54).

7. As to claim 3, Matsui et al. further anticipates the steps of: c1) assigning a specific access code (e.g., see col. 2 (lines 1-21), col. 7 (lines 19-54)) to the conference client by using a predetermined algorithm; and c2) logging in (e.g., see col. 2 (lines 47-48), col. 8 (lines 6-16)) the cyber-conference operating website (conference rooms, chat rooms, col. 7, lines 19-54) with the specific access code assigned by the cyber-conference operation server (chat server 100).

8. As to claim 4, Matsui et al. further anticipates the steps of: d1) creating for the cyber-conference based on a cyber-conference building program (command button on the screen or icon, col. 5 (lines 1-21)); and d) providing content for the cyber-conference (e.g., see col. 4, lines 2-10).

9. As to claim 5, Matsui et al. further anticipates the steps of: e1) setting opening/closing date of the meeting (e.g., see col. 4, lines 54-56); and e2) providing technical section (changing password for participation ..., a change in the user ..., a request to generate a common key, etc.) of the cyber-conference (e.g., see col. 4, lines 57-60).

10. As to claim 6, Matsui et al. further anticipates the steps of: e3) receiving an application of participation to the meeting from the user client (e.g., see col. 4 (lines 54-62), col. 7 (lines 19-45)); e4) assigning a temporary access code to the user client (unique e-mail address of the user, col. 7, lines 51-54) to the user client completing the application under the control of the cyber-conference operation server; and e5) receiving data to be presented in the meeting (e.g., see col. 4 (lines 60-61), col. 7 (lines 19-24)) from the user client completing application.

11. As to claim 7, Matsui et al. further anticipates the steps of: e51) classifying (configuring) the received data depending on the technical section (changing password for participation ..., a change in the user ..., a request to generate a common key, etc., col. 4, lines 57-60) to store the same on predetermined location (icon of a key, command button on the screen, col. 5, lines 18-19).

12. Claims 8-10 are similar in scope as of claims 1-7, and therefore claims 8-10 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above for claims 1-7

13. The rejections are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action with some modification due to the amendment filed June 1, 2005.

14. Applicant's arguments filed March 01, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that Matsui did not teach or suggest the feature of providing a presentation paper making-up utility from the user client and publishing a journal of papers presented at the cyber-conference that includes the presentation paper from the user client.

In response, yes, it is true that Matsui et al. did not explicitly mention the term "a presentation page making-up utility" and "publishing a journal of papers presented during the cyber-conference". However, to the extent of the claimed language interpretation and since the claims are given the broadest interpretation, examiner interprets that "a presentation page making-up utility" would have been obviously "a security program ... that can display a command button on the screen, the electronic conference room, an icon .." and "publishing a journal of papers presented during the cyber-conference" would have been obviously "display a sign such as an icon ... to identifying the electronic room ..."

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2153

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisna Lim whose telephone number is 571-272-3956. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday and Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess, can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KI

August 21, 2005



KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER